

From:

5032242084

12/11/2007 18:42

#426 P.012/016

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
DEC 11 2007

REMARKS

Claims 1-12 and 14-21 are pending.

Claims 1-12 and 14-21 are rejected.

Claim 13 was previously cancelled.

Claim 21 is cancelled herein.

Claims 1, 4, 12 and 14 are amended.

Claims 22-24 are new. No new matter is added.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

The examiner rejects claims 1-12 and 14-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over Sekiguchi (5,798,864) in view of Schaefer et al. (7,094,502).

The rejection is traversed.

Sekiguchi describes a projection apparatus which calculates and displays a Fraunhofer diffraction image in order to project the original image on a screen. The original image is projected as a high field angle image without the need to divide the image into partial images (col. 2 lines 22-40).

Claim 12 is amended to recite the features of previously presented claim 21, now cancelled. Therefore claim 12 is amended to include the same features as previously examined claim 21 such that the amendment of claim 12 would not necessitate a further patent search or new grounds for rejection. Amended claim 12 recites a method of forming a two dimensional image on a screen comprising:

illuminating an electrically addressed spatial light modulator with coherent light,

displaying a computer generated hologram image on the electrically addressed spatial light modulator so as to diffract light therefrom,

sub-dividing the two dimensional image into blocks,

sequentially writing the blocks to the screen, and

directing light diffracted by the electrically addressed spatial light modulator to produce a two dimensional image at the screen.

The Sekiguchi apparatus is an example of the conventional projection techniques described in Applicant's background section (page 1 lines 7-10). A diffraction image displayed

AMENDMENT

PAGE 9 OF 12

DO. NO. 7758-0026
SERIAL NO.10/542,491

on the LC display 203 of Sekiguchi is ultimately magnified and projected to the screen as the original image (FIG. 2).

While the Examiner rejected previously presented claim 21 under USC 102(b) over Sekiguchi, no specific reference (page and/or reference number) was provided such that Applicant is able to completely reply to the rejection of claim 21 without making certain assumptions. Applicant assumes that the Examiner has rejected claim 21 based on an official notice that "it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to apply the concept of Sekiguchi et al. to alternate known types of illumination systems" as provided in the last full paragraph on page 2 of the office action. Alternatively, Applicant assumes that the rejection of claim 21 was intended to be grouped in with the rejection of claims 7-9 and 16-19 wherein the Examiner takes official notice that "it would have been obvious to provide such computer control means in order to allow for the projection of various images."

In either case, the rejection is traversed. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner provide evidence that the method recited by amended claim 12, including the features of previously presented claim 21 specifically, were well known at the time of invention.

Furthermore, Applicant respectfully submits that the official notice taken with respect to the rejection of claims 7-9 and 16-19 fails to address the features recited at least by claims 9 and 17 which recite a device wherein the array of pixels on the screen is sub-divided into blocks and the image at the screen is formed by sequentially writing one or more blocks to the screen. Even assuming that the computer control means (presumably referring to claims 7, 8 and 16?) were obvious, this official notice fails to identify or otherwise explain how the features of claims 9 and 17 are obvious.

Claim 1 is amended to recite, in part, a device for forming a two dimensional image on a screen comprising:

optics to direct light diffracted by the electrically addressed spatial light modulator means to the screen,

wherein the sequential computer generated images displayed on the electrically addressed spatial light modulator means result in a single frame of the two dimensional image.

Sekiguchi fails to disclose the sequentially computer generated images of amended claim

1. In contrast, Sekiguchi describes that a single Fraunhofer diffraction image results in a single

From:

5032242084

12/11/2007 18:43

#426 P.014/016

displayed image (FIG. 2), or of three Fraunhofer diffraction images simultaneously presented (FIG. 10).

Previously presented claim 6 recites a device according to claim 1 wherein a frame rate of the electrically addressed spatial light modulator means is greater than a frame rate of the two dimensional image formed at the screen. The Examiner fails to indicate where in Sekiguchi these features are disclosed. Applicant respectfully submits that Sekiguchi cannot be understood to disclose the features of claim 6 since the frame rate of the LC display 203 is identical to the frame rate of the projected image; the projected image being the same as the original image transformed into the Fraunhofer diffraction image of the LC display 203. Claim 14 is amended to recite the features of claim 6 and is therefore allowable for the same or similar reasons in addition to the further novel features recited therein.

At least for the above reasons, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-12 and 14-20 is respectfully requested.

Any statements made by Examiner that are not addressed by Applicant do not necessarily constitute agreement by the Applicant. In some cases Applicant may have amended or argued the allowability of independent claims thereby obviating grounds for rejection of the dependent claims.

AMENDMENT

PAGE 11 OF 12

DO. NO. 7758-0026
SERIAL NO.10/542,491

From:

5032242084

12/11/2007 18:43

#426 P.015/016

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
DEC 11 2007

Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-12, 14-20 and 22-24 in the application as amended is requested. The Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at (503) 224-2170 if it appears that an interview would be helpful in advancing the case.

Customer No. 73552

Respectfully submitted,

STOLOWITZ FORD COWGER LLP



Bryan D. Kirkpatrick
Reg. No. 53,135

STOLOWITZ FORD COWGER LLP
621 SW Morrison Street, Suite 600
Portland, OR 97205
(503) 224-2170

AMENDMENT

PAGE 12 OF 12

DO. NO. 7758-0026
SERIAL NO.10/542,491